

So, therefore, the 35-105 figure is a figure which is quite defensible. Admittedly, it is a compromise figure. The Committee itself at one point tied ten to ten on a House of 80, and a Senate of 40, and the compromise of 35-105 was reached after several hours of debate, but was reached in the spirit of the democratic process.

Turning now to the question of one delegate per delegate district, and one senator per senate district, we will address ourselves to that question which has created the most commotion in Baltimore City.

The Committee recognized the fact that prior to reapportionment Maryland had by and large throughout its history, at least from 1837 on, the single-member district for the State Senate. The upper house had always been throughout our modern history a single-member district. The fact is change was brought about by reapportionment, and it would not be unfair to say that the tradition of the single-member district in the Senate was departed from somewhat reluctantly in some areas. Maryland today has a combination of both multi-member and single-member districts.

At the present time, 39 bodies, that is to say, either a House or Senate, in 26 states of the Union, use single-member districts exclusively, so the idea of a single-member district is not one which is new.

I think it is also interesting to note that despite the arguments that are made about the difficulty of using single-member districts within a large urban area, New York decided to continue the single-member district for both houses of its state legislature, despite the fact that it has within its confines the largest city of the United States.

Now, the arguments for a single-member district are many, and I am just going to outline them briefly.

First of all, it strengthens the two-party system, because it is quite obvious that one can have a large minority party in any political subdivision, and yet as a result of a sweep, 55-45 split between one party and the other might well produce no representatives from the minority party. For example, in a political subdivision, which was electing 8, 12 or 16 members to a lower house, and was constituted with 55 per cent of one party and 45 per cent of another, all the members of the majority party might well win and none of the members of the minority party, thereby effectively removing the possibility of ade-

quate minority representation, despite a significant and large, but not majority voter registration on the part of the minority party.

Committee Recommendation L-B1 reduces the possibility of a clean sweep by one party, and to that extent it strengthens the two-party system.

Today the average voter who must in certain sections of the state vote for eight members of the lower house, may well be acquainted with one, two, three or four, but having exhausted those possibilities and those connections, must then play the alphabet game of voting for everybody under the "A's" or may look for a name which appeals to him, or may look for men or women, as the case might be. The Committee felt that where one is forced to address oneself to the question of voting for multiple candidates, in reality these votes are lost, particularly beyond the level of personal acquaintanceship or knowledge of the parties and that to the extent that the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh or eighth spot on the ballot must be filled, it is often filled by happenstance rather than intention on the part of the voter.

Under the single-district voter arrangement, every voter in the state would have but one senator and one delegate, so that he would address himself, particularly in the primary election, to selecting one of each. In the general election, there would be the typical head-on clash, between the two major parties of the district, but one would be in a position to know at all times who his one senator was, and who his one delegate was, so that there would be no evasion of responsibility, one would know who to call upon for constituent services, and one could evaluate and know how ones senator or ones delegate voted.

There is greater visibility, and greater responsibility placed upon the shoulders of those who serve in a single member district arrangement in both House and Senate than there is in those areas where you can get lost as one among eight or one among four, five, six, or seven. This high visibility, this greater sense of responsibility, this greater opportunity for public scrutiny, the Committee felt, I might say, by a vote of 15 to 5, would provide a better Senate and a better House and a better kind of representation for the people of Maryland.

Of course, one of the happy by-products of using the single-member district would be cutting down on the long ballot.